



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

than either French or German, the benefit derived from its study must be correspondingly greater. To some psychologists this argument will, I suppose, be anathema; to ordinary common sense it seems axiomatic. Human speech, the author continues (13), is subject always to change. French, Spanish, etc., are not 'descended' from Latin (such language involves a mistaken metaphor, in a word, tells an untruth); they *are* Latin or forms of Latin. So we may call Latin the oldest Italian, the oldest Spanish, the oldest French. From this point of view, then, Latin is not a dead language. It follows with equal force that to the students of the Romance or Neo-Latin languages the charm of the study of the old Roman tongue should be well-nigh irresistible. I may quote here the words of a professor of Romance languages to a class in Old French: "If it were not for Latin, we should have no use whatever for any of you".

C. K.

(*To be continued.*)

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FORCELLINI LEXICON¹

One of the first surprises that the student of the Classics meets is the frequent uncertainty of the authorship of the works that have come down to us from antiquity. The authorship of the great works is usually certain, or tolerably so, but as the student leaves the beaten track of the literature, he finds questions of authenticity assuming more and more frequent importance. The reasons for this are familiar and obvious, and I shall not waste space by dwelling upon them here. What I wish to emphasize and illustrate is that even in our own times the question of authenticity has sometimes been obscured, to the manifest injury of the real author. The case I have taken is the authorship of the Forcellini *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*. One who consults the ordinary books of reference on this question soon becomes involved in a maze of contradictions and inaccuracies. The *Century Dictionary*, under Forcellini and Facciolati, credits each of these scholars with the authorship of the work. *Harpers' Classical Dictionary*, under Forcellini, says: "His ability and industry soon gave him an honorable rank, so that he was appointed assistant to Facciolati, with whom his name is inseparably associated in their joint work (*Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*), whose completion was in great part due to the untiring labor of Forcellini". From this statement one certainly gets the impression that Facciolati conceived the work, began it, and did a large share of the labor involved in its preparation, while Forcellini brought it to a close. The same impression is conveyed by what we read in the same volume under the name of Facciolati: "After putting

forth several new editions of existing books, . . . he began his magnificent work, the *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, the first volume of which appeared at Padua in 1771 . . . an imperishable monument to the learning, industry, and judgment of its chief author. In its preparation he was ably assisted by his pupil, Egidio Forcellini, to whom is said to be due the suggestion of the new lexicon itself". Here again, Facciolati is "the chief author" of the work. Forcellini is not ignored; he is even credited with the original conception of the plan, but his share in the work is distinctly represented as subordinate.

Turning to the article *Lexicon* in the *Harpers' Dictionary*, we read: "Forcellini's labors on the revision of Calepinus had taught him the need of a more perfect lexicon, and he undertook to construct it. For forty years he toiled, and at his death left in manuscript the greatest contribution to this department of science ever achieved by a single hand, the *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*". Thus, while under the names of Facciolati and Forcellini the *Harpers' Classical Dictionary* attributes the *Lexicon* to Facciolati, under the article *Lexicon* it attributes it just as unqualifiedly to Forcellini alone, without mention of Facciolati. The ordinary reader must certainly be puzzled by these conflicting statements, and must wonder whether the work represents the genuine collaboration of two scholars; if not, whether in conception and execution it is essentially Facciolati's, or Forcellini's. I might add that the *Universal Cyclopedia* and certain other works I have consulted are no less contradictory than those I have already cited¹. I trust therefore that it will not seem superfluous to present the evidence bearing upon the question of the authorship of the *Lexicon*.

In testing the truth of the conflicting statements which meet us in connection with the names of Facciolati and Forcellini, we naturally turn to the title-page of the original edition of the *Lexicon*, published at Padua in 1771. This reads: *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, Consilio et Cura Jacobi Facciolati, Opera et Studio Aegidii Forcellini lucubratum*. The obvious implication of this title-page is that Facciolati planned the *Lexicon* and worked on it, receiving assistance from Forcellini.

But before we accept the evidence of the title-page, we need to know more about its origin. Who wrote it? This takes us back to the circumstances of the publication of the *Dictionary*. In 1771, the year of publication, Forcellini had been dead three years. He had brought the work to a close in 1753. Some years were then devoted to the transcription by a friend. The copying was completed and the manuscript was handed over by Forcellini to the Library of the Padua Seminary, where it reposed for years. Forcellini died in 1768. The following year Cardinal

¹ This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Princeton University, April 22, 1911.

¹ The account by Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 2.374 f., though necessarily brief, is essentially correct.

Prioli was appointed to the see of Padua. This enlightened ecclesiastic at once recognized the importance of the manuscript and sent the book to the printer. This was early in 1769. As it went to press, the title-page read: *Latinitatis Totius Lexicon in Patavino Seminario cura et opera Aegidii Forcellini lucubratum*. No mention here of Facciolati, either as author of the plan of the work, or as aiding in its preparation. But Facciolati was still living, at the advanced age of 87, and in some way exercised his influence to secure an alteration of the title-page and to procure the insertion of his own name before that of Forcellini, so that as published the book seemed to belong chiefly to Facciolati.

Let us examine whether there was justification for this tampering with the manuscript copy. In determining this question, we can hardly do better than give a short sketch of the relations between Forcellini and Facciolati. It was about 1710 when Forcellini graduated from the Paduan Seminary, of which Facciolati, only six years his senior, was the head. Soon after his graduation, Forcellini's services were enlisted by the Director in the preparation of a Greek lexicon. This work, a revision of the *Lexicon* of Schrevelius, appeared in 1715. Not only Forcellini, but other pupils also of Facciolati had aided in the revision; Facciolati's name is the only one upon the title-page. A similar experience fell to Forcellini's lot in 1718, when the *Ortografia Italiana Moderna* was published. Despite its name, this work was essentially a dictionary. The labor on it seems to have been performed mainly, if not entirely, by Forcellini. Yet again it is Facciolati's name that adorns the title-page. The book had great vogue, going through eight editions between 1718 and 1741. Forcellini's brother and his friend Natalis dalla Laste resented the omission of Forcellini's name, and dalla Laste in the preface to one of his own works publicly referred to "the *Ortografia* of Signor Egidio Forcellini, which by some subtle artifice had thus far been published under the name of Facciolati". Finally in the eighth edition of the *Ortografia*, published in 1741, Facciolati made belated acknowledgment of the share borne by Forcellini in the various editions of this work. A letter which Forcellini himself writes to his brother Marco at this time and in this connection gives us a most pleasing impression of his character and temper. So far from complaining at the injustice done him by the omission of his name from the first seven editions of the *Ortografia*, he is modest enough to say that he does not deserve and cannot deserve to be enrolled among the scholars of his time, and that he regrets that Signor Dottore Facciolati has mentioned him in the Preface to the new edition of the *Ortografia*. In editing this letter many years later, Forcellini's brother adds: "En! Quo modo de se loquebatur noster Aegidius!"

Almost contemporary with the issue of the *Ortografia* was that of the revision of the old Latin lexicon of Calepio. Forcellini had labored diligently, assisting Facciolati with this work, between the years 1715 and 1718. Facciolati had probably done the major part of the labor on this volume, and the work might fairly be called his; yet Forcellini is not mentioned even by name. In the Preface Facciolati merely says that he has had the assistance of a "strenuissimus adolescens".

Here then we have three instances in which Facciolati seems to have been willing to take to himself the credit of another's work; and one of the instances was so bad as to cause a public scandal at the time. These facts may make it easier for us to form a judgment concerning any doubtful points connected with the authorship of the *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*.

In connection with the authorship of the *Lexicon*, two questions present themselves. First, to whom belongs the credit for the conception of the new dictionary? Second, to whom belongs the credit for its execution? To both of these questions I answer unhesitatingly: To Forcellini, and to him alone. When after forty years of labor he had brought to a close the manuscript of the *Lexicon* and had given it to Ludovico Violato to be transcribed, he prepared a little memorandum, which fortunately has been preserved, though never printed till De-Vits's edition of the *Lexicon* in 1858. In this memorandum Forcellini begins with a Latin couplet:

Phoebus utrumque polum decies quater axe revisit
hoc nostra immensum dum manus urget opus.

He then goes on to say that his revision of the old Calepio in 1715-1718 had taught him that further revisions of that *Lexicon* were useless, and that what was needed was an entirely new work. Accordingly toward the end of 1718, he tells us, he had begun the present *Lexicon* at the command of the Bishop of Padua. He then gives us the details of his long task, telling of his progress and his interruptions. It took nearly three and a half years to finish the letter A; at the end of six years he had reached *comitor*, when he was suddenly called away for seven years. During this time work was completely suspended—from 1724 to 1731. Returning to his labors in 1731, he worked continuously for eleven years, reaching the word *pone* in 1742. At that time he was appointed confessor to the local clergy, a duty which left him such scant leisure for the *Lexicon* that for the next nine years his progress was extremely slow. At length in 1751 he was released from his post as confessor and was again enabled to devote his entire energy to his great task. It is an interesting coincidence that he resumed his labors at this time with the word *thesaurus*. In February, 1753, the monumental undertaking was completed in the first draft, and was handed over to Ludovico Violato to be

copied. This is the substance of the memorandum, written in Forcellini's own hand at the time he ended the work. One reference in the memorandum I have designedly omitted. Forcellini tells us that he had undertaken the work *ductu Jacobi Facciolati*. But this is probably the exaggeration of his own simple, unassuming, nature. From the Preface of the Lexicon, of which I shall speak presently, we can only infer that this *dictu* implies no more than that Facciolati had approved of the plan and had possibly given occasional advice.

I have just been speaking of the private memorandum left by Forcellini. We come now to the Preface of his work. In this he tells us that Facciolati had planned two lexicons, a Greek and a Latin. The Greek with the assistance of Forcellini and others he had published: "but the Latin", says Forcellini, "because it was seen to require more attention, he turned over to me to prepare alone, not that he thought I possessed any special ability, but because he saw that I had health and capacity for sustained effort. And so, after forty years", he continues, "the work is ended, I performing the labor, he furnishing advice and assistance, *me prae-bente manum, illo consilium atque opem*". Just how much may be understood by *consilium et opem* might be hard to say, were it not that Forcellini in his memorandum has given us such a detailed account of the progress of the work, letter by letter. Its progress, we saw, depended on Forcellini's leisure; its stagnation always followed his occupation with other duties. Apparently then, *consilium et opem* are nothing more than the utterances of a generous spirit, loyal still to his old teacher, despite the scant justice which Facciolati had accorded to Forcellini's earlier assistance.

The general conclusions I have indicated are confirmed by all other evidence bearing on the case. The man who finally put the Lexicon through the press after the death of Forcellini was Gaietano Cognolati. He also supplied a special preface to the work. In this he pays the loftiest tribute to Forcellini's character and genius. "In him", he says, "there were *ingenium, litterae, cura, cogitatio, diligentia*. He was thoroughly versed in everything pertaining to Roman literature, institutions, and history; he was also well trained in Greek. I mourn his loss, now that he is taken from us, as much as I revered him himself when alive. Never can I forget that man, since with his interest in literature he combined the sort of character for forming which literature is intended". Cognolati then goes on to describe what Forcellini had achieved in his great work, going into minute detail. But not once is the name of Facciolati mentioned, though its omission is inexplicable except on the assumption that he had no real share in the undertaking.

It remains to consider a letter written by Fac-

ciolati himself, soon after Forcellini had finished his labors on the Dictionary and at the time Violato was busy in the preparation of the fair copy. The letter is addressed to Joseph Lasta, Librarian of St. Mark's at Venice. Lasta apparently had heard rumors bearing on the validity of Facciolati's claims to the authorship of the revised Calepio, and seems to have inquired of Facciolati for the facts. With characteristic lack of frankness, Facciolati begins by saying: "How's that, my friend? You say I didn't write the Calepio? I never pretended to. Calepio wrote it". He then goes on to say that in the revision of the Calepio he had availed himself of the services of Forcellini, and, pleased by the reception which that work had met, he had undertaken a new lexicon which should be as complete as could be made, employing the assistance of the same Forcellini. The work, he says, proceeded with various vicissitudes until its completion in 1753. The last two lines of the letter are these: *Vix ego in plerasque litteras quippiam contuli praeter consilium. Princeps hujus operis conditor atque adeo unus Forcellinus est.* 'Under most of the letters I furnished nothing but advice. The chief author of this work, and in fact the only one is Forcellini'. This is undoubtedly the truth, spoken in a moment of contrition. I say, in a moment of contrition, for when, twelve years later, the printing of the book began, Facciolati was not only willing to claim the chief credit for it, but actually succeeded in accomplishing his purpose, as we see by the title-page of the original edition. Worse than this, he endeavored to suppress the admission which he had made in his letter to Lasta from which I just quoted, and actually reprinted the letter twice omitting the significant words: *Princeps hujus operis conditor atque adeo unus est Forcellinus*.

Such seem to be the facts concerning the authorship of the Lexicon. Facciolati, while certainly not lacking in gifts, appears to have been a man of small character, ready always to utilize the services of others and to take to himself the credit for their work. In the case of the revision of Schrevelius, of Calepio, and in the preparation of the *Ortografia Italiana*, he did not hesitate to ignore the important services rendered by Forcellini and others. In the case of the *Ortografia*, it was only when forced by what was virtually a public exposure, that he tardily, in his eighth edition, made recognition of Forcellini's share in the work. Forcellini, on the other hand, was one of those simple, sweet, unresentful natures that might almost be said to invite imposition. Ambition does not appear to have stirred him. He saw the need of doing the work. If others wished to claim the credit, it was not for one so unworthy as he to protest; and even when others did protest in his name, and with success, he seems actually to have been pained.

As to the conception of the idea and plan of the great Lexicon, we have Faccioliati's own statement in one of his rare moments of frankness that Forcellini was solely responsible for it. In the execution of the work, it seems equally clear that Faccioliati had no hand. He himself admits that for most letters he furnished nothing but advice. In view of what we know of his character and methods, it is probably safe to infer that he actually wrote no part of the Lexicon. That at times he conversed with Forcellini about the work is very likely. But such conversations do not establish the faintest claim to credit as joint author. Least of all can there be any defense for the alteration of the title-page of the original edition, procured at Faccioliati's instance and through his influence. To steal a dead man's work is doubly base.

For nearly a century every reprint of the Lexicon repeated the misleading title-page. It remained for Vincente De-Vit to show by the citation of the documents to which I have referred¹ how baseless were the claims of Faccioliati, and in the Prato edition of 1858 to restore a true title of the work.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

To the kindness of Professor Kelsey we are indebted for a copy of the following letter, which appeared in *The Daily Mail* (London), July 29, 1911.

There is no one in the world so fiercely dogmatic as the apostle of change. With nothing save first principles to aid him, he is ready to outrage the accumulated wisdom of all the ages. He lives in an atmosphere of reckless experiment, and yet refuses to accept responsibility for the evil that he does. His ignorance is complete and invincible; his pride matches his ignorance. For him, whatever is wrong, and so little respect does he cherish for the past that he thinks himself competent to devise a hundred schemes for the regeneration of the race.

It is not often that we are fortunate enough to see the beginning and end of a loudly trumpeted reform. That good fortune is ours to-day. During the last few years the humanities have been assailed in France with peculiar bitterness. That light-witted country, whose custom it is to question all things, to proceed gaily from false premises to a logical conclusion, has succeeded at last in the practical suppression of the dead languages. In her lycées and universities she has resolved to teach nothing that will not be of use to her pupils in their future career. The formula is perfectly familiar to us. We may now measure the havoc that has been wrought by its parrot-like repetition.

In obedience to popular clamour, the professors of France resolved to replace the literary education, which had held sway for centuries, by a study of exact science. They kept sternly in view the demands of counting-house and workshop. We will not train the boy's mind, said they; we will pack his brain with useful facts. He shall not think; he shall remember. Strictly cut off from a knowledge of the past, he shall live solely in the present. Thus there will be no waste of force. A full pocket shall reward his industry, and if his head is empty

of those general ideas which cumbered his father's, so much the better for him. He will get rich the more quickly.

A Lesson from France.—A vain hope, which has not been realized. The abolition of the humanities in France has been followed by an ominous decay in the national intelligence. The utilitarian system of education, which was to increase tenfold the 'efficiency' of France, has proved a disastrous failure. The calculating machine beloved to-day is no proper substitute for a thinking, sentient man. In the craft of letters the deficiency is the most conspicuous. After all, the humblest writer cannot expect success without some knowledge of the instrument he uses, and it is only through the 'dead languages' that we may arrive at an understanding of those which still live. Many years ago Matthew Arnold declared that the journey-work of literature was far better done in France than in England, and he attributed the superiority to the influence of Riche-lieu's famous academy. Alas! the influence of the academy, vastly over-rated by Matthew Arnold, is to-day dead or dying; and the suppression of Latin and Greek has removed the last check which was laid upon the careless misuse of the French tongue. If we praise the journalism of modern Paris, we praise it as those who find a magnificence in the half-understood. French is not so stubborn a language as English. The novice may write it with a facility which looks at first sight as though it were genuine. Ever since Voltaire revealed his method to an eager world, a set of stock phrases, 'clichés' they call them, has been at the service of anyone who can afford a fountain pen. Unfortunately, the mind undisciplined by the study of Latin and Greek does not understand the stock phrases which the fountain pen traces mechanically upon paper. Never was there so rash and careless a creature as the French journalist. Knowing no other speech than his own, he cannot refrain from embellishing his periods with Latin and English tags.

Where Science has failed.—It is here indeed that the French journalist is more painfully deficient. Knowing not Latin, which is the mother of French, he does not understand the origins and associations of the phrases he employs. It is not clear to him (how should it be?) that words, like ancient houses or the faces of men and women, are marked and scarred by their past history. The science which was to have saved his soul alive has not taught him to think or given him the rudiments of style. Reckless of analysis, he confuses his images with the abandonment of an Irishman. But there is the difference between his mixed metaphors and Irish 'bulls'. The humor of an Irish bull is always half-conscious. When Sir Boyle Roche said, "I smell a rat; I see it hurtle through the air; but I will nip it in the bud", it was a stroke of genius. He joyfully paraded his own extravagance. There was no pride in the French reporter who solemnly declared the other day that "Mme. Judic's talent was like a bottle of ink in which the scalpel must not be used too freely for fear of finding there only a pinch of cinders". That is the folly of an illiterate man who has never been taught to think or to see in words anything more than lifeless symbols.

But it is not the men of letters who denounce most bitterly the evil influence of 'practical' education. It is the man of science, the engineers, the captains of industry. The makers of steel, the inspectors of mines, the chiefs of the medical schools are uniting in a protest against the tyranny of

¹In the Preface to his edition of the Lexicon.